

## Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 01283 01 OF 03 082056Z  
ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-04 INR-07 L-03 ACDA-07  
NSAE-00 PA-01 SS-15 PRS-01 SP-02 USIA-06 TRSE-00  
NSC-05 EB-08 /072 W  
-----082123Z 076634 /73

R 081800Z MAR 77  
FM USMISSION NATO  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 2086  
SECDEF WASHDC  
INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS 6884  
CINCLANT  
USCINCEUR  
USLOSACLANT  
USNMR SHAPE

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 1 OF 3 USNATO 1283

E.O. 11652: GDS  
TAGS: MPOL, NATO  
SUBJECT: MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE 1977: DRC DISCUSSION, 7 MARCH 1977

REF: (A) USNATO 1049 (DTG 251845Z FEB 77), (B) USNATO 0445  
(DTG 261917Z JAN 77), (C) USNATO 1110 (DTG 021055Z  
MAR 77), (D) STATE 049216 (DTG 050121Z MAR 77)

SUMMARY: DURING A REMARKABLY HARMONIOUS AND SUBSTANTIVE  
DEFENSE REVIEW COMMITTEE (DRC) DISCUSSION OF THE FIRST  
DRAFT OF MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE 1997, A CONSENSUS EMERGED  
THAT THE PRESENT DRAFT WOULD HAVE TO BE RESTRUCTURED TO  
PROVIDE A SELF-CONTAINED DOCUMENT, RATHER THAN AN ANNEX TO  
1975 GUIDANCE, AND TO PROVIDE MORE COMPREHENSIVE COVERAGE  
OF KEY AREAS, SUCH AS THE LONG-RANGE DEFENSE CONCEPT (LRDC),  
THE THREAT, ALLIANCE DEFENSE DEFICIENCIES, CURRENT STRATEGY,  
WARNING TIME, COOPERATIVE DEFENSE EFFORTS AND PRIORITIES.  
THE INTERNATIONAL STAFF (IS) WILL PRODUCE A SECOND  
DRAFT FOR DRC CONSIDERATION LATER THIS WEEK. END SUMMARY.  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 01283 01 OF 03 082056Z

1. IN OPENING DRC FIRST READING ODF DRAFT MINISTERIAL  
GUIDANCE 1977 (REF A), CHAIRMAN (ASYG MUMFORD) NOTED  
THAT, AT THEIR DECEMBER MEETING, MINISTERS HAD RECOGNIZED  
THE ADVERSE TRENDS IN THE NATO-WARSAW PACT BALANCE AND  
THE NEED FOR A NET INCREASE IN RESOURCES DEVOTED TO  
DEFENSE, AND STATED THAT THE GUIDANCE DOCUMENT SHOULD  
THEREFORE (A) BE A SHORT, PUNCHY AND READABLE PAPER  
DESIGNED FOR MAXIMUM IMPACT ON MINISTERS AND GOVERN-  
MENTS; (B) FOCUS ON MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS WHICH HAVE  
EMERGED OVER THE PAST TWO OR THREE YEARS; (C) BE ABLE

TO STAND ON ITS OWN WITHOUT BEING ALL-EMBRACING; (D) CONTAIN THE RIGHT MESSAGE TO NATO MILITARY AUTHORITIES (NMA) AND NATIONS FOR PREPARATION OF FORCE GOALS AND NATIONAL PLANNING; AND (E) BE FORWARDED TO PERMREPS BY THE THIRD WEEK IN APRIL. SUBSEQUENT DRC DISCUSSION FOCUSED ON (A) STRUCTURAL AND (B) SUBSTANTIVE REVIEW OF THE DRAFT.

2. STRUCTURAL REVIEW.

A. NMA COMMENTS. MC (CDRE GELUYCKENS), SHAPE (BGEN SCHWEITZER) AND SACLANT (CDRE COTE) REPS APPLAUDED THE THRUST, FORMAT AND LENGTH OF THE DRAFT.

B. NATIONAL COMMENTS. ON INSTRUCTIONS, THE CANADIAN REP (COL OLSON), JOINED BY FRG (BGEN SCHUENEMANN), DANISH (BELLING), NETHERLANDS (WIJNAENDTS) AND US (BADER) REPS, REITERATED THE CONSENSUS EXPRESSED DURING THE PRECEDING DRC MEETING (REF B) THAT THE 1977 GUIDANCE SHOULD BE A SELF-CONTAINED DOCUMENT, CAPABLE OF STANDING ON ITS OWN, COMMENTED THAT THE PRESENT DRAFT FAILS TO MEET THIS CRITERION, AND STATED THAT MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE 1975 SHOULD NOT BE ASSUMED TO BE VALID; RATHER, 1975 GUIDANCE SHOULD BE REEXAMINED AND RESTATED WHERE APPROPRIATE.

3. SUBSTANTIVE COMMENTS.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 01283 01 OF 03 082056Z

A. SECTION I (INTRODUCTION). A NUMBER OF REPS RECOMMENDED THAT THE INTRODUCTORY SECTION SHOULD (1) CONTAIN A GENERAL STATEMENT OF THE PURPOSE OF MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE, (2) NOTE THE DETERRENCE AND DEFENSE OBJECTIVES OF NATO, AND (3) INCLUDE A RE-STATEMENT OF DRDC. US AND CANADIAN REPS EMPHASIZED THE NEED FOR A CONCISE RESTATEMENT AND UPDATING OF THE LRDC WHICH WOULD ESTABLISH THE TONE AND BASIC FRAMEWORK OF THE GUIDANCE DOCUMENT. DUTCH REP AGREED THAT THE LRDC IS AN ESSENTIAL ELEMENT OF 1977 GUIDANCE AND SUGGESTED THAT, IN ADDITION, THE NMA SHOULD BE TASKED TO PROVIDE A COMPLEMENTARY LONG-RANGE OPERATIONAL CONCEPT. IN RESPONSE, SHAPE REP CAUTIONED AGAINST INVENTING NEW PROCEDURES, IMPLEMENTATION OF WHICH WOULD REQUIRE A DIFFERENT TYPE OF ORGANIZATION.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 NATO 01283 02 OF 03 082102Z

ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-04 INR-07 L-03 ACDA-07

NSAE-00 PA-01 SS-15 PRS-01 SP-02 USIA-06 TRSE-00

NSC-05 EB-08 /072 W

-----082124Z 076700 /73

R 081800Z MAR 77  
FM USMISSION NATO  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 2087  
SECDEF WASHDC  
INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS 6885  
CINCLANT  
USCINCEUR  
USLOSACLANT  
USNMR SHAPE

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 2 OF 3 USNATO 1283

B. SECTION II (DEVELOPMENT IN THE THREAT). A CONSENSUS EMERGED THAT THIS SECTION SHOULD BE REDRAFTED TO REFLECT THE THRUST OF WARSAW PACT IMPROVEMENTS AND THE IMPLICATIONS WHICH THESE DEVELOPMENTS HAVE FOR ALLIANCE DEFENSE PLANNING, RATHER THAN THE PRESENT DRAFT'S REVIEW OF INDIVIDUAL WARSAW PACT IMPROVEMENTS DURING THE PAST SEVERAL YEARS. US REP SUGGESTED THAT REFERENCES TO THE NEED FOR A "COUNTERPART" TO THE SS-20 (PARA 6) AND THE DISCUSSION OF US-SOVIET ASYMMETRIES IN SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS (PARA 13) BE DELETED.

C. SECTION III (IMPLICATIONS FOR NATO'S DEFENSE PLANNING). MOST REPS FAVORED A RESTRUCTURING OF THIS SECTION TO (1) GIVE GREATER ATTENTION TO ALLIANCE SHORTFALLS AS REFLECTED IN THE MILITARY APPRECIATION AND THE 1976 DEFENSE REVIEW; (2) CONTAIN A PARAGRAPH DESCRIBING THE STRATEGY OF FLEXIBLE RESPONSE AND REAFFIRMING ITS SOUNDNESS; AND (3) INCLUDE A SHORT DISCUSSION OF WARNING TIME. US REP COMMENTED THAT THE PRESENT DRAFT MIXES "IMPLICATIONS" AND "PRIORITIES" IN THIS SECTION, AND  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 01283 02 OF 03 082102Z

EXPRESSED THE NEED FOR A SEPARATE SECTION ON PRIORITIES. REGARDING "NEW TECHNOLOGIES," US REP SUPPORTED BY THE FRG REP, RECOMMENDED THAT PARA 22 BE DELETED AND PARA 23 BE REDRAWN MORE IN LINE WITH THE MIT AND PIT STUDIES. TURKISH REP (TOPUR) STATED THAT HIS AUTHORITIES WOULD LIKE TO SEE COVERAGE IN GENERAL TERMS OF (1) THE LIMITATIONS ON TURKISH FORCE IMPROVEMENTS IMPOSED BY RESTRICTIONS ON MILITARY ASSISTANCE AND (2) THE CONTINUED PROBLEMS IN MILITARY PLANNING, TRAINING, AIR DEFENSE, ETC. CAUSED BY GREECE'S NON-PARTICIPATION IN ALLIANCE DEFENSE ACTIVITIES.

D. SECTION IV (RESOURCES FOR DEFENSE PLANNING). ALTHOUGH NO DRC REP REJECTED OUT OF HAND THE NEED FOR A SPECIFIC LEVEL OF ANNUAL REAL INCREASES, A CONSENSUS QUICKLY DEVELOPED AROUND THE IDEA OF USING MORE THAN ONE SIMPLE YARDSTICK (SUCH AS REAL ANNUAL INCREASE) TO MEASURE DESIRABLE LEVELS AND TRENDS FOR DEFENSE SPENDING. UK REP FAVORED ADDING REFERENCES TO DESIRABLE LEVELS OF: PERCENTAGE OF GDP FOR DEFENSE, PER CAPITA DEFENSE EXPENDI-

TURES, PERCENT OF INVESTMENT IN DEFENSE BUDGET AND EXTENT TO WHICH INFLATIONARY INCREASES ARE COVERED. NETHERLANDS REP SUGGESTED ADDING NATIONS' ECONOMIC STRENGTH, PRESENT FORCE CONTRIBUTION AND EXTENT OF RATIONALIZATION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE EFFORT AS CRITERIA FOR JUDGING DESIRABLE RESOURCE LEVELS. NETHERLANDS AND US REPS SUGGESTED THE NEED FOR NMAS TO EXAMINE MORE CLOSELY HOW NATIONS SPEND THEIR DEFENSE BUDGETS, AND CAUTIONED ON THE NEED FOR FULL JUSTIFICATION FOR DESIRABLE RESOURCE TARGETS. THE US REP ALSO SUGGESTED THAT NMAS SHOULD BE INSTRUCTED TO EXAMINE COUNTRY PROGRAMS FOR TRADE-OFFS; RATHER THAN JUST FOCUSING ON WHAT SHOULD BE ADDED TO A COUNTRY PROGRAM, THE NMAS SHOULD IDENTIFY WHAT COULD BE CUT TO ACCOMMODATE HIGHER PRIORITY NATO FORCE GOALS. CHAIRMAN AND US REP STRONGLY FAVORED AVOIDING AMBIGUITY IN THIS SECTION, SUCH AS MIGHT RESULT FROM A "RANGE" OF DESIRABLE RESOURCE TARGETS.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 NATO 01283 03 OF 03 082106Z  
ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-04 INR-07 L-03 ACDA-07  
NSAE-00 PA-01 SS-15 PRS-01 SP-02 USIA-06 TRSE-00  
NSC-05 EB-08 /072 W

-----082121Z 076730 /73

R 081800Z MAR 77  
FM USMISSION NATO  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 2088  
SECDEF WASHDC  
INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS 6886  
CINCLANT  
USCINCEUR  
USLOSACLANT  
USNMR SHAPE

CONFIDENTIAL SECTION 3 OF 3 USNATO 1283

E. SECTION V (ALLIANCE COOPERATION). CONSENSUS QUICKLY DEVELOPED THAT IS DRAFT WAS TOO NARROWLY FOCUSED (ON DEFENSE EQUIPMENT PLANNING TO THE EXCLUSION OF OTHER COOPERATIVE AREAS); BELGIAN, DANISH, NETHERLANDS, RG AND US REPS ADDED THAT THE DRAFT DELVED TOO DEEPLY INTO THE MATTER OF EQUIPMENT PLANNING FOR A DOCUMENT TO BE APPROVED THIS SPRING. DRG AGREED THAT NEXT DRAFT SHOULD BE MORE GENERAL AND CONCEPTUAL (TOUCHING UPON ALL AREAS OF ALLIANCE COOPERATION, AS DID 1975 MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE), BUT THAT THE DESCRIPTIVE APPROACH OF THE 1975 GUIDANCE SHOULD YIELD TO A MORE PRESCRIPTIVE ONE. MOST REPS AGREED THAT MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE 1977 WOULD NOT, AND SHOULD NOT "WRITE THE BOOK" ON COOPERATIVE DEFENSE PLANNING, BUT SHOULD PROVIDE SUFFICIENT DIRECTION TO

PERMIT THAT BOOK TO BE WRITTEN, AND TO ENABLE THE  
EFFECTIVE INTEGRATION OF SUPPORT PLANNING AND FORCE  
PLANNING.

F. SECTION VI (PUBLIC SUPPORT FOR DEFENSE). DRC  
EXPRESSED APPROVAL OF THE PRESENT DRAFT OF THIS SECTION.  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 01283 03 OF 03 082106Z

4. IN CONCLUDING DISCUSSION ON DRAFT GUIDANCE, THE  
CHAIRMAN NOTED THAT THE COMMITTEE HAD HAD A LIVELY AND  
CONSTRUCTIVE SESSION AND STATED THAT THE IS WILL PRODUCE  
A SECOND DRAFT FOR DRC CONSIDERATION, ON THE BASIS OF  
CURRENT INSTRUCTIONS, LATER THIS WEEK. A NUMBER OF REPS  
AGREED TO PROVIDE LANGUAGE TO ASSIST THE IS IN REVISING  
AND FLESHING-OUT THE PRESENT DRAFT. STRAUSZ-HUPE

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 30-Aug-1999 12:00:00 am  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Sent Date:** 08-Mar-1977 12:00:00 am  
**Decaption Date:** 01-Jan-1960 12:00:00 am  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 22 May 2009  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1977NATO01283  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Expiration:**  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**Format:** TEL  
**From:** NATO  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1977/newtext/t197703110/baaabcew.tel  
**Line Count:** 236  
**Litigation Code IDs:**  
**Litigation Codes:**  
**Litigation History:**  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Message ID:** 379901b0-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc  
**Office:** ACTION EUR  
**Original Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 5  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** (A) USNATO 1049 (DTG 251845Z FEB 77), (B) USNATO 0445 (DTG 261917Z JAN 77), (C) USNATO 1110 (DTG 021055Z MAR 77), (D) STATE 049216 (DTG 050121Z MAR 77)  
**Retention:** 0  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 04-Apr-2005 12:00:00 am  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**SAS ID:** 2962097  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE 1977: DRC DISCUSSION, 7 MARCH 1977  
**TAGS:** MPOL, NATO  
**To:** STATE SECDEF MULTIPLE  
**Type:** TE  
**vdkgvkey:** odbc://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS\_Docs/379901b0-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc  
**Review Markings:**  
Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
22 May 2009  
**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009